



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,643	01/15/2004	KahHing Ting	STL11217	5810
7590 04/25/2007				
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey & Tippens, P.C. Suite 1700 100 North Broadway Oklahoma City, OK 73102-8820			EXAMINER STACE, BRENT S	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/758,643

Applicant(s)

TING ET AL.

Examiner

Brent S. Stace

Art Unit

2161

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7, 9-18 and 20.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


APU MOFIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

It appears the the Applicant's are not considering the combination of the references as intended.

The Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting "simultaneously executing the plurality of query statements to access said database and transfer associated data subsets into a memory space by logging into the computer network under a different login account for each query statement" the examiner respectfully disagrees. Carley shows that it is beneficial to use single-login (using a single user-id). However, Carley merely suggests that management of coordinating the multiple ID's and passwords associated with the single logon may be difficult. However, it is possible (as suggested in Carley). Carley makes it apparent that Carely uses single logon in Carley, col. 130, lines 57-60 with Carley, col. 131, lines 5-6. By using single login, and the requirement to coordinate the multiple ID's and passwords associated with the single logon ID, it is apparent that single login is used to activate the multiple ID's and passwords so that the user needs only to logon once (single logon) for the system to automatically use the correct multiple ID's and passwords to logon to other systems.

Applicant's arguments, filed November 28th, 2006, with respect to Claims 11-18 and 20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 11-18 and 20 for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching or suggesting "initiates an auto-brake function that limits input/output transfer elapsed time to a maximum value during said transfers of the associated data subsets into the third memory space so that said transfers of the associated data subsets are interrupted when the maximum value is reached," the examiner respectfully disagrees. Marmor, paragraph [0031] was cited to rejection this limitation in Claim 11. Marmor, as cited and admitted by applicant's teaches a query packet where the query packet has a time to live (TTL). This TTL limits how long the query packet will be valid so the query packet is not immortal querying systems in Marmor for information. Applicant's arguments focus solely on Marmor. However, in the rejection below, Marmor is used in combination with Hallmark. Hallmark's queries retrieve content (Hallmark, col. 5, lines 60-63 "results"). Merely the TTL feature of Marmor's queries are being combined into Hallmark's queries (as originally stated). It should also be noted that the queries in both systems, in a broad sense, retrieve/transfer content.